

Association for Library Collections & Technical Services  
(A division of the American Library Association)  
Cataloging and Classification Section

*Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access*

**MINUTES**

**Minutes of the meeting held at the  
2011 ALA Midwinter Meeting in San Diego, California  
January 8, 2011**

**Members present:**

Lori Robare, Chair  
Patricia Dragon  
Sylvia Hall-Ellis  
Kevin Randall  
Peter Rolla  
Kathy Winzer  
Bob Wolverton  
Martha M. Yee

John Ilardo, Intern  
Gayle Porter, Intern  
Melanie Polutta, CC:DA Webmaster

**Ex-officio representatives present:**

John Attig, ALA representative to the Joint Steering Committee  
Barbara Tillett, Library of Congress  
Glenn Patton, OCLC  
Charles Wilt, ALCTS

**ALA Liaisons present:**

Susan L. Cheney, ALA/LITA  
Laurence S. Creider, ALA/ACRL

Robert C. W. Hall, Jr., ALA/PLA  
Richard Hasenyager, Jr., ALCTS/CCS/CC:CCM  
Elizabeth Mangan, ALA/MAGERT (represented by Dorothy McGarry)  
John Myers, ALCTS/LITA/RUSA/MARBI  
Hikaru Nakano, ALCTS/CCS/CC:AAM  
Nancy Mitchell Poehlmann, ALCTS/CRS (represented by Jennifer Young)  
Nathan B. Putnam, ALCTS/MIG  
Randy Roeder, ALCTS/PARS  
Ken Wade, ALA/RUSA  
Karen A. Weaver, ALA/GODORT

**Non-ALA Liaisons present:**

Thomas Duszak, CLA  
John Hostage, AALL & IFLA  
Diane Hillmann, DCMI  
John Ilardo, PCC  
Chamya P. Kincy, MedLA  
Judy Knop, ATLA  
Dan Lipcan, ARLIS/NA  
Dorothy McGarry, SLA  
Kelley McGrath, OLAC  
W. Curtiss Priest, IEEE LTSC  
Mark Scharff, MusLA  
Aaron Taub, AJL

**Notes:**

- I. The minutes do not necessarily record discussion in the order in which it occurred. Material may have been rearranged in order to collocate items related to specific topics for clarity.
- II. While recordings of the CC:DA meetings were made, the process of transcription is laborious. Only in the case of some comments are exact quotes made.
- III. In CC:DA minutes, a “vote of the Committee” indicates a poll of those Committee members appointed in their own right rather than those representatives of a particular constituency. These votes are a formal representation of Committee views. The Chair

rarely votes except to break a tie. The term “straw vote” indicates a poll of the ALA and other organizational representatives to CC:DA who are present. Such votes are advisory and are not binding upon the Committee. Where no vote totals are recorded, and a CC:DA position is stated, the position has been determined by consensus.

- IV. In CC:DA minutes, the term “members” is used to apply to both voting and non-voting appointees to the Committee. Where a distinction is necessary, the terms “voting members” and “liaisons” are used.
- V. Abbreviations and terms used in these minutes include:

<b>AACR2</b>	<i>Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules</i> , 2nd ed., 2002 revision
<b>AALL</b>	American Association of Law Libraries
<b>ABA</b>	Acquisitions and Bibliographic Access Directorate
<b>ACRL</b>	Association of College and Research Libraries
<b>AJL</b>	Association of Jewish Libraries
<b>ALA</b>	American Library Association
<b>ALCTS</b>	Association for Library Collections & Technical Services
<b>ARLIS/NA</b>	Art Libraries Society of North America
<b>ATLA</b>	American Theological Libraries Association
<b>BISAC</b>	Book Industry Subject and Content
<b>CC:AAM</b>	ALCTS/CCS/Committee on Cataloging: Asian and African Materials
<b>CC:CCM</b>	ALCTS/CCS/Cataloging of Children’s Materials Committee
<b>CC:DA</b>	ALCTS/CCS/Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access
<b>CCS</b>	ALCTS/Cataloging and Classification Section
<b>CIP</b>	Cataloging in Publication
<b>CLA</b>	Catholic Library Association
<b>CSB</b>	<i>Cataloging Service Bulletin</i>
<b>DC</b>	Dublin Core
<b>DCMI</b>	Dublin Core Metadata Initiative
<b>FRAD</b>	IFLA’s <i>Functional Requirements for Authority Data</i>
<b>FRBR</b>	IFLA’s <i>Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records</i>
<b>FRSAD</b>	IFLA’s <i>Functional Requirements for Subject Authority Data</i>
<b>GODORT</b>	ALA/Government Documents Round Table
<b>IEEE LTSC</b>	IEEE Learning Technology Standards Committee
<b>IFLA</b>	International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions
<b>ILS</b>	Integrated library system

<b>ISBD</b>	<i>International Standard Bibliographic Description</i>
<b>JSC</b>	Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA
<b>LC</b>	Library of Congress
<b>LCRIs</b>	<i>Library of Congress Rule Interpretations</i>
<b>LITA</b>	Library & Information Technology Association
<b>MAGERT</b>	Map and Geography Round Table
<b>MARBI</b>	ALCTS/LITA/RUSA Machine-Readable Bibliographic Information Committee
<b>MARC</b>	Machine-Readable Cataloging
<b>MedLA</b>	Medical Library Association
<b>MIG</b>	ALCTS/Metadata Interest Group
<b>MusLA</b>	Music Library Association
<b>NISO</b>	National Information Standards Organization (U.S.)
<b>OLAC</b>	Online Audiovisual Catalogers
<b>PARS</b>	ALCTS/Preservation and Reformatting Section
<b>PCC</b>	Program for Cooperative Cataloging
<b>PLA</b>	Public Library Association
<b>RDA</b>	<i>Resource Description and Access</i>
<b>RUSA</b>	Reference and User Services Association
<b>SAC</b>	ALCTS/CCS/Subject Analysis Committee
<b>SLA</b>	Special Libraries Association
<b>XML</b>	Extensible Markup Language

***Saturday, January 8, 2011, 1:30–5:30 p.m.***  
***San Diego Marriott and Marina, Marriott Hall 4***

**1120. Welcome and opening remarks**

Lori Robare, **Chair**, called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m., and welcomed committee members, liaisons, representatives, and visitors. She announced that the CC:DA meeting scheduled for Monday January 10, 2011 will take place if further discussion is needed.

**1121. Introduction of members, liaisons, and representative**

Committee members, liaisons, and representatives introduced themselves. The **Chair** routed the roster for members to initial and correct, if necessary, and an attendance sheet for visitors.

**1122. Adoption of agenda**

[CC:DA/A/63]

There were no additions or corrections to the agenda. **Hall-Ellis** moved to adopt the agenda, with **Winzer** seconding. The motion carried unanimously and the agenda was adopted.

**1123. Approval of minutes of meeting held at 2010 Annual Meeting, June 26 and 28, 2010**

[CC:DA/M/1103-1119]

**Rolla** moved to approve the minutes, with **Winzer** seconding. The motion carried unanimously.

**1124. Report from the Chair**

Chair's report on CC:DA motions and other actions, June 19-December 20, 2010:

[CC:DA/Chair/2010-2011/2]

In accordance with CC:DA procedures, the **Chair** presented the following motions previously approved online for confirmation:

- **Review ISBD Consolidated Edition:** 8 voted in favor; no opposed.
- **Report of the CC:DA Task Force for the Review of RDA and the Chicago Manual of Style 16<sup>th</sup> edition:** The Task Force formation was approved but delayed, pending resolution of an expected proposal to delete specific instructions on capitalization from RDA Appendix A.

A motion to confirm approval of these actions was made and seconded; the motion carried.

### **1125. Report from the Library of Congress Representative: Tillet**

[LC Report, January 2011]

**Tillet** presented a concise version of the full LC report for the Committee, and encouraged meeting attendees to view the full report online for news items of interest throughout the LC organization. Her report focused on current news about descriptive cataloging. She invited people to visit the LC exhibit booth (number 1751) for presentations on cataloging issues such as MARC, authority work, FRBR, RDA, RDA test, along with web casts on notable non-cataloging topics such as the interview with Paul McCartney upon accepting the Gershwin prize; and the History Channel's feature on the Library of Congress and its functions. A list of the presentations is available.

**Tillet** reported on a few of the many employees who retired from LC this year: Marybeth Peters, the Register of Copyrights and the long-time head of the Copyright Office, retired at the end of December. Within Library Services, the retirement that most affects CC:DA members is Bob Hiatt from the Policy & Standards Division. Unfortunately, **Tillet** will not be able to replace Hiatt, which will create some difficulties in terms of responding to email queries. A macro will acknowledge messages sent to the email address ([policy@loc.gov](mailto:policy@loc.gov)). Staff will address the issues but may or may not be able to respond with individual solutions to queries and might not respond in a timely manner regarding details on how they resolved issues; **Tillet** apologized in advance for that. Paul Weiss, one of the key subject policy specialists, will retire in February 2011. His retirement will greatly affect the turnaround time on the editorial process for both LC classification and LC subject headings; they will need to review that whole process in terms of how often they have a review and how they will respond. Page 4 of her report lists information about some other retirements at LC: Judith Mansfield, chief of the US/Anglo Division, has retired; Allene Hayes is serving as acting Chief of the Anglo Division during the interim period.

On page seven, **Tillett** included information about the ECIP Cataloging Partners program. Three new member libraries joined the program since the ALA annual conference: the University of Pennsylvania in July; Queens Public Library, and Frick Arts Reference Library both joined the program in autumn. Northwestern University Libraries, a long-time ECIP partner, has expressed interest in cataloging all the African studies information in the program, which will be a big plus. Also on page seven is information about LC experimenting with adding additional subject access points from other thesauri to LC bibliographic records. They are adding terms from the American Mathematical Society classification system as part of the CIP process: the incoming data as part of the normal CIP workflow is automatically being added (by computer programs) to CIP records. Additionally, BISAC codes coming from publishers are being added, which will provide additional subject access. Hopefully this will help LC original catalogers to determine the appropriate subject analysis.

On page ten, **Tillett** reported that LC will not change headings with the abbreviation “Dept.” to the fuller form at this time. LC had queried the library community about this issue, seeking opinions regarding a long-standing AACR2 provision that the U.S. libraries had never adopted, i.e., the practice of “department” being abbreviated. LC staff considered this issue again in light of changes before they adopt RDA; many people supported it as a long-overdue change, but it is not the best timing. The issue will be revisited after a decision is made about RDA implementation.

**Tillett** directed people to page 13 of her report to see statistics. LC staff worked very hard on cataloging, and although the numbers for full original cataloging decreased, the total number of volumes cataloged increased, despite a major reorganization of the ABA directorate and several retirements.

**Tillett** provided updated information about Romanization tables. One African language, Vai, was approved by CC:AAM and is available online on the LC Romanization webpage; it is also published in *CSB*, no. 128, along with the latest revision proposals for the Thai Romanization table. Comments from the cataloging community on the Thai Romanization table are welcome through March 2011.

**Tillett** pointed readers to page 14 for information about the 16% increase in the number of items cataloged by the Geography and Map Division.

**Tillett** reminded readers on page 16 and 17 about the reorganization of the Office of Business Enterprises which absorbed parts of the Cataloging Distribution Service along with the other business enterprises of the library shop and photo duplications and duplications services. Information is included about free PDF versions of various publications such as the *Subject Headings Manual*, the *CONSER Cataloging Manual*, the *Descriptive Cataloging Manual*, and the LCRIs. The report includes two pages of news about the reorganization of Business Enterprises at LC.

**Tillett** referred readers to page 19 which has information about upgrades to the ILS: The Voyager system at LC was upgraded to 7.2.0; the current OPAC interface will remain available indefinitely. LC is slow to add new versions, as they need to go through many tests. They plan to soft-launch the OPAC, known as Tomcat, in the next several weeks before the end of February. Tomcat will provide some faceted search capabilities and some other features that staff plan to explore and test.

**Tillett** reported on an experiment to review the XML Data Store, now called the National Library Catalog. It is a beta implementation internal to LC and will be available later in January. It has a one-box approach to search LC's various internal systems and files. It will include e-resources; OPAC data; EAD finding aids; and the Performing Arts Encyclopedia digital collections.

**Tillett** referred attendees to pages 5-6 of her report for the latest information on the US RDA Test and also to the end of her report for the latest information on webcasts and presentations about the test. The test began with a three-month learning phase (July-September), then a three-month data-gathering phase (October-December). **Tillett** invited attendees to two open meetings about the US RDA Test results to be held Sunday, January 9<sup>th</sup> in the Convention Center. The meeting for vendors is in Room 109 from 8:00 a.m.-9:00 a.m. This will allow participants to speak with vendors about what's happening, what to expect, and how vendors will be able to use the catalog records that were prepared and collected for the RDA test. The general interest/participants meeting will take place in Room 7A at 10:30 a.m., wherein participants will comment on the test.

**Tillett** provided statistics (as of January 4, 2011) on the more than 10,000 bibliographic records and 12,800 authority records collected during the test phase. Those records are available at the website she provided. LC is still collecting records, as people are still submitting them. By mid-January all of the test records should be available. During December 2010 the test records



website had 2576 hits. She expects people to use the records, but warned that they reflect many different policies and practices: some people followed Library of Congress practice; others chose many variations. The Coordinating Committee wanted to see what people did and what the impact would be, whether by a minimalist approach, adding only core elements or LC Core Plus elements. **Tillett** expects to see policy changes in the U.S. and work done with the Program for Cooperative Cataloging to make more consistently applied policies in the U.S. The LC policy statements will be edited later this year to reflect LC's decision about RDA. The test feedback will be valuable for working towards those goals.

#### **1126. Report of the ALA Representative to the Joint Steering Committee: Attig**

**Attig** reported that since June 2010, the JSC has been correcting reported errors in RDA. He also reported that the JSC has held preliminary discussions to begin working through some of the larger issues that have been deferred, but that those conversations are still ongoing and that, to date, no firm decisions have been reached.

**Attig** promised to inform the group of the date of the next JSC meeting when it is finally scheduled. The earliest date being considered is July 2011, but he expressed doubts as to whether a July meeting would ultimately occur.

**Attig** anticipates that before ALA Annual 2011, CC:DA will begin receiving proposals from other constituencies to which CC:DA will need to respond. Attig proposed the following process for handling CC:DA review:

Proposals from the JSC are posted on the JSC website. When a new proposal is announced by the JSC, the Chair of CC:DA will post the proposal on the CC:DA wiki, and make an announcement and a call for comments. In general, the comment period will be open for two weeks. Exceptions will be made for especially complex or lengthy proposals. At the conclusion of the comment period, a small, informal group will assess the comments, prioritize any issues that have been raised, and determine the timeline for any actions to be taken by CC:DA. Following a vote, Attig will draft the ALA response and submit the document to the JSC, which will distribute it as a JSC document.

The **Chair** noted that she will be sending out instructions reminding members how to access and use the CC:DA wiki after the close of the ALA Midwinter 2011 meeting.

**Creider** asked whether the full committee would have an opportunity after the comment period has closed to review and comment upon proposals that come before CC:DA and contribute to the ALA response. **Attig** asserted that the committee would be able to comment upon a proposal and contribute to the ALA response until official action, e.g., a vote, has been taken by CC:DA, at which point Attig will draft the official response in consultation with the full committee only when clarification is necessary.

**Attig** stated that one of the proposals CC:DA can expect is a discussion paper from LC on how to structure the as yet undrafted chapters on subject attributes and relationships in RDA. He noted that while CC:DA is currently the only group charged to authorize an ALA response, this discussion paper will require special treatment since subject issues do not fall within the jurisdiction of CC:DA. Attig is working with the Chair and Daniel Joudrey, the current Chair of SAC, to determine whether the two groups can draft a consensus proposal to submit to the CCS Executive Committee. A decision will be communicated to the group when it has been reached.

**Attig** stated that there are two concerns: 1) that a procedure be put in place in order to ensure that such proposals are reviewed and commented upon by those whose advice is considered necessary; and 2) that a joint decision-making process be put in place in order to deal with future issues that involve a split jurisdiction. He expressed particular concern for future JSC representatives, and stated that he wished to see a process put in place that could yield meaningful results simply, quickly, and predictably.

**Tillett** pointed out that this type of split jurisdiction issue is not unprecedented within CCS: a similar situation occurred when the *Draft procedural guidelines for proposed new or revised Romanization tables* required comment from both CC:DA and CC:AAM.

**Attig** reported that he has encouraged the Chair and Daniel Joudrey to arrange a joint CC:DA-SAC meeting for ALA Annual 2011 to discuss both the expected discussion paper and the process for future collaboration on the chapters of RDA that deal with subject entities.

**Myers** expressed a desire that the process be designed 1) to preserve the sanity of the JSC representative; 2) to provide a clear channel for providing input to the JSC representative; 3) to empower SAC to provide official comment on similar issues going forward; and 4) to effectively leverage CC:DA's structure and experience dealing with the JSC representative. **Attig** agreed that all are worthy objectives.

Helen **Schmierer** from the audience asked to what extent the process will be informed by FRSAD, and about the status of the review of that document.

**Tillett** asked Glenn Patton whether he wished to comment on the status of FRSAD. **Patton** stated that he has not had very much involvement in the review of that document, but **McGarry** was able to confirm that FRSAD was approved at IFLA in summer of 2010.

**Schmierer** asked whether FRSAD had been published. **Tillett** speculated that it probably had, but could not provide specifics. **Patton** stated that the electronic version had not yet been released. **Tillett** said that, in any case, the working group was eager to share its report and she and **Schmierer** encouraged those interested in reading the document to contact the co-Chairs, Marcia Lei Zeng, Athena Salaba, and Maja Zumer.

**Attig** noted that one of the challenges is that there are currently three functional requirement models that deal in some degree with Group 3 entities, and that all do so in different ways. He noted that a reconciliation process is underway, and specifically mentioned that Gordon Dunsire is working to develop a merged, machine-readable schema. But he stated that the JSC is reluctant to wait to see the results of that process before initiating work on drafting the chapters in RDA that deal with subject attributes and relationships.

The **Chair** pointed out that a possible agenda item for a joint CC:DA-SAC meeting might be a review of the various functional models that deal with Group 3 entities in order to give both committees a solid understanding of the models and where they diverge.

**Hillmann** offered her support for such a review and recommended inviting Gordon Dunsire to participate in that process. The **Chair** asked whether he attends ALA meetings, to which **Hillmann** replied that he does not typically attend. She stated that, if an overture were to be made, and some funding secured, she believes he would attend.

**McGarry** asked whether the IFLA ISBD Review Group, chaired by Pat Riva, has initiated its own process of reconciling the three functional requirement models. She suggested inviting Pat Riva to participate in any review process CC:DA or SAC initiates. **Tillett** stated that that FRBR Review Group is the one to which Attig referred, and one on which she, Glenn Patton, and Pat Riva all serve. She said that a reconciliation process began with a full-day meeting in Gothenburg, Sweden, during the IFLA 2010 meeting, and that work will continue at the IFLA 2011 meeting.

**Sherman Clarke** from the audience suggested that someone from the Getty Research Institute also be invited, as they have a different perspective on certain Group 3 entities.

**1127. Revision proposals from AALL: Hostage**

[CC:DA/AALL/2010/1]

[CC:DA/AALL/2010/2]

**Hostage** reported on two RDA revision proposals.

The first RDA revision proposal addressed two questions: 1) should RDA rule 16.2.2.9 be revised to include special instructions for federations? and 2) if yes, should the instructions apply to all federations? One of the goals was to determine whether or not a more principled approach could be developed. As an example, he said that AALL had considered treating all place names according to the general rule, which would specify that each place name be qualified by the country in which it is located, but concluded that this approach would probably not be helpful to users, and would break with traditional practice and the way in which places are generally identified within their own countries.

AALL determined that there was no empirical basis on which to overturn the longstanding practice of treating places in certain federations under special instructions. Concerning the second question, **Hostage** stated that AALL concluded that it is probably not realistic to expect catalogers to be able to identify the state or other territorial unit in which a place is located in every case, nor is doing so likely to provide significant benefits to users. Moreover, the lack of a clear definition of “federation” complicates the question.

**Hostage** reported that AALL has recommended removing the country of Malaysia from instruction 16.2.2.9. AALL acknowledges that Malaysia is in fact a federation consisting of a number of states and federal territories, but doubts that most catalog users outside of the country of Malaysia are familiar enough with those states and federal territories for qualified place names to be of much benefit. **Hostage** indicated that LCRI 23.4, which calls for cross references qualified with “(Malaysia)” for all geographic names for places within Malaysia, supports AALL’s assessment.

**Hostage** reported that AALL has recommended qualifying both the U.S.S.R. and Yugoslavia with the phrase “the former,” in recognition of the fact that both states are now defunct.

**Hostage** reported that AALL has also recommended the creation of a general instruction for overseas territories and insular areas and places in overseas territories and insular areas, which are not mentioned explicitly in RDA but are addressed in 16.2.2.9.1. Treatment in RDA of these geographic areas would remain the same; the rule would simply be made more explicit.

The **Chair** invited discussion of this proposal.

**Attig** stated that the question is complex, and suggested starting with the treatment of the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia and their territories. He asked if AALL's proposal would eliminate these countries from 16.2.2.9 in favor of treatment under the general rule (16.2.2.8).

**Hostage** clarified that the only change pertaining to those two countries was in the language of 16.2.2.9; both would still be treated under the special instructions for federations. He pointed out, however, that the proposal would move examples for former Soviet republics—such as present day Ukraine and Croatia—to a section that provides for treatment under the general rule.

**Adam Schiff** from the audience expressed two concerns: 1) that removing the example of Slovenia from 16.2.2.9.1 would leave the rule without an example of how a former Yugoslav republic should be treated; and 2) that the rules are not sufficient to deal with complicated cases, such as historical jurisdictions (i.e., now-defunct jurisdictions).

**Hostage** conceded his second point might be valid, but stated that such complicated cases were outside the scope of the proposal. To Schiff's first point, **Hostage** noted that two examples could be provided in 16.2.2.9.1: one for the Socialist Republic of Slovenia, and a second for Slovenia, the modern, independent state. But he stated that, from his perspective, he did not want to commit too much energy to accommodating defunct jurisdictions.

**Attig** noted that the rules in chapter 16 supplement the rules given in chapter 11, which provide instructions on establishing names of jurisdictions. As corporate bodies, the name of the jurisdiction is established based on the name at the time, or during the time period, under consideration. If the name of the jurisdiction changes, it becomes a different jurisdiction, so the basic principles for dealing with historical changes are already in place. He acknowledged temporary federations as problematic, and mentioned that he had floated some ideas on the rules discussion list ([rules@ala.org](mailto:rules@ala.org))—including the idea that a former republic like Slovenia

might be addressed using a single heading to refer to both the Soviet republic of Slovenia, and Slovenia, the modern, independent state—but that they were not entirely acceptable.

**Yee** offered her approval of the recommendations listed in the proposal, but suggested that, as a way of moving the discussion forward, CC:DA review and discuss each of the recommendations separately.

The **Chair** asked **Hostage** if he would address each of the bulleted points in the report's summary.

**Hostage** explained that the first recommendation was to add the words “the former” to the language of 16.2.2.9, in acknowledgement that the U.S.S.R. and Yugoslavia are now defunct. **Attig** agreed that, if special instructions for these two former federations are retained, they need to be revised as proposed, but he reiterated that he would prefer to see them treated in non-exceptional ways.

**Rolla** stated that he thought AALL's proposal provided a simple and elegant solution. **Schiff** from the audience agreed, but reiterated his objection to striking the examples that show how the headings are to be constructed for a place such as Kiev, Ukraine, which would have the same form of the heading pre-1991 and post-1991. **Rolla** concurred.

**Hostage** explained that the second recommendation was to create new instructions (16.2.2.11) for overseas territories and insular areas and places in overseas territories and insular areas, which are not mentioned explicitly in RDA but are addressed in 16.2.2.9.1. **Attig** asked why AALL chose the name “overseas territories and insular areas,” which is not the way these areas are denoted in the LCRI 23.4B (there, “islands and island groups”)? **Hostage** explained that AALL chose “overseas territories” because it is the term used for some French territories, and “insular areas” because it is the generic term used by the United States Office of Insular Affairs. He said that AALL is open to changing the language. **Randall** expressed concern that the word “overseas” might not always be accurate. **Tillett** recommended using “island areas” instead. **Attig** pointed out that this recommendation also proposes moving the relevant examples from 16.2.2.9.1, 16.2.2.9.2, and 16.2.2.9.11 to the section containing the new instruction for overseas territories and insular areas.

**Myers** expressed concern that AALL's proposal is perhaps too Anglo-American-centric. He pointed out that, for example, the French are unlikely to think of their territories as being

“overseas.” He stated that we need to respect such perspectives, if RDA is to be a truly international code. He also expressed concern that the insular areas associated with Great Britain are treated differently than the insular areas of France. As an example, he compared the treatment of Ramsey and certain other insular territories of the United Kingdom in 16.2.2.10.2—which is qualified with its larger jurisdiction—with the treatment of Guadeloupe in 16.2.2.11.1—which is *not* qualified with its larger jurisdiction. He objected that this represents an Anglo-American conceptualization of the world, and is not inclusive of other international perspectives.

**Hostage** responded by saying that neither Ramsey (Isle of Man) nor Jersey (Channel Islands) is qualified by the larger jurisdiction “(United Kingdom)”; however, **Attig** pointed out that this is because there is a rule that prescribes that the larger jurisdiction not be recorded.

**Attig** stated that, in his view, the critical exceptions are the four Anglo-American countries—Australia, Canada, United States, and the United Kingdom. He proposed that CC:DA redefine rule 16.2.2.10 as the general rule and provide exceptions—or “alternatives”—for each of the Anglo-American countries. This would result in a single rule applicable to all of the non-Anglo-American countries, and provide a template for each country to decide whether it will follow the general rule or create its own alternative. This would not resolve the question of whether to treat the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia and their territories according to the general rule or an alternative.

The **Chair** called for discussion of Attig’s proposal, but pointed out that CC:DA has adequate time to consider and revise the proposal before the next meeting of the JSC.

**Winzer** offered tentative approval for Attig’s proposal, but stated that she would need to see the proposal written down before she would be able to endorse it fully. She proposed tabling the issue until the proposal has been put in writing. **Attig** agreed that if CC:DA wants to give consideration to such sweeping revisions, the current AALL proposal would need to be officially deferred, and more time requested to consider the issue. He asked Winzer whether she saw any flaws in his proposal that would make her unwilling to defer the issue in favor of further consideration. **Winzer** stated that she would need to see the proposal in writing before she could comment on it.

**Hostage** acknowledged that Attig’s proposal is certainly a viable one. However, he disagreed with Myers’s assertion that the treatment of places in the British Isles (16.2.2.10) shows Anglo-

American bias. He stated that 16.2.2.10 primarily establishes which places should be treated like sovereign countries. He pointed out that the Isle of Man is a crown dependency (whereas Guadeloupe is an overseas region of France), and that it therefore deserves the special treatment provided under 16.2.2.10.

**Hostage** said that the essential question that seems to underlie the current rules for island areas is how much distance separates the island territory from the country's central territory. He asked whether Corsica and Sardinia are qualified, respectively, by France and Italy under the current rules (they are), and pointed out that places such as Guadalupe, Puerto Rico, French Polynesia, or Guam are not. He said that, by virtue of the distance that lies between these latter places and the central territories of the countries to which they belong, they are treated as special jurisdictions under the current rules. He asserted that this does not, however, amount to, e.g., a denial of French sovereignty.

**Randall** asked whether the general convention of qualifying a place name with the name of the larger jurisdiction to which it belongs is intended to communicate 1) the name of the larger jurisdiction to which a place belongs, or 2) the geographic proximity of a place to the central territory of the country to which it belongs. **Hostage** responded by saying that the current approach appears to revolve around the question of geographic proximity. **Attig** said that the cataloging community certainly gets nervous when territories are not contiguous, and that this is partly why the exceptions in rules were originally created. **Schiff** said that these decisions have also been based on how places are named in the literature. To illustrate this point, he noted that in the literature Paris is commonly referred to as Paris, France, but that Guadalupe is not typically referred to as Guadalupe, France. He suggested that this difference might be due to the different geographic relationships these places have with the country of France. **Attig** pointed out that the rule states to include the name of the larger place in which it is located *or* the larger jurisdiction to which it belongs.

The **Chair** suggested that CC:DA continue the discussion of AALL's proposal and Attig's alternate proposal on the discussion list, and asked Hostage to report on AALL's second RDA revision proposal.

The second RDA revision proposal from AALL pertains to RDA rule 6.29.1.21, which provides instructions for the construction of authorized access points for reports from one court.



**Hostage** reported that the proposed revision limits the use of authorized access points containing the authorized access point representing a reporter to nominate reports issued before 1866. For all reports issued after 1866, the proposed revision instructs that the authorized access point representing the report be based on the authorized access point representing the court. He stated that the proposal's objective is to simplify the complex process of analysis required by the rule in order to determine authorized accessed points. He also noted that the proposed revision would bring the practice of naming such reports according to RDA in line with the practice by which such reports are cited in the legal literature.

**Attig** asserted that the reference to "nominate reports" is meaningless for people who are not already familiar with the term and unnecessary for people who are. He concluded that the parenthetical phrase, "as in the case of the English nominate reports prior to 1866," is therefore unnecessary, and asked that it be omitted from the proposed revision to 6.29.1.21.2 (per the rule numbering in AALL's report). **Hostage** said that he thought the parenthetical helped those who are familiar with nominate reports identify exactly what is denoted by the noun phrase "reports ... ascribed to a reporter or reporters by name." **Tillett** responded that the parenthetical complicated the rule for those who are not familiar with nominate reports. **Attig** asked if individuals familiar with nominate reports would understand that nominate reports are the referent of the expression "reports ... ascribed to a reporter or reporters by name" without the parenthetical. **Hostage** answered affirmatively, but said that he thought it provided clarity for those individuals who are working with reports from other countries. **Attig** said that that is a pretty specific piece of case law that needn't be referenced in the language of the rule. He offered his support for the proposal overall, agreeing that it greatly simplifies the decision-making process, but said that he thought the reference in the parenthetical is still too technical.

**Myers** said that, as a generalist, he could see the value in specifically naming those reports issued before 1866 as "nominate reports," and suggested that the rule could be rearranged to read, "as in the case of English reports prior to 1866, commonly known as nominate reports," admitting that "commonly" is probably not the appropriate word. **Attig** expressed doubts about the accuracy of Myers's proposed revision, and stated that he did not think it would be helpful. **Winzer** noted that nominate reports were also issued in the United States, so omitting the parenthetical would in fact be more accurate than retaining it.

**Hostage** said that one concern was that some reports issued after 1866 might bear the name of the reporter in part responsible for it, and that, without the parenthetical, it would not be clear that such reports should not be considered "ascribed to a reporter or reporters by name." The

parenthetical is an attempt to limit application of the rule to nominate reports—defined as reports ascribed to a reporter or reporters by name *issued before 1866*—specifically. **Attig** said that if the parenthetical is intended to have such a limiting effect, it needs to be rewritten to be more explicit. **Hostage** conceded the point and said that he had no objection to removing the parenthetical. **Attig** asked whether there was general agreement that it should be removed.

**Creider** said that, as a generalist, he, too, could see the value in including an explanation such as the one provided in the parenthetical. **Winzer** suggested replacing the parenthetical with a more explicitly limiting parenthetical. **Attig** said that, if the intent is to limit the reference of the noun phrase, “reports ... ascribed to a reporter or reporters by name,” then the proposed parenthetical is not sufficient and needs to be rewritten. He said that, as far as he understands it, the compound noun “nominate report” is defined as “a report ascribed to a reporter or reporters by name,” and reiterated that that is precisely how nominate reports are denoted in the rule. He said he therefore sees no need for elaboration or parenthetical qualification.

**Winzer** reiterated Hostage’s point that a concern is that some reports issued after 1866 might bear the name of the reporter in part responsible for it, and that the generalist cataloger might consider such a report as “ascribed to a reporter or reporters by name.” **Attig** reiterated that if the parenthetical phrase is intended to exclude such reports, it needs to be rewritten. He also pointed out that it isn’t simply that a reporter is named; it’s that the report is specifically known by the name of the reporter. He said that those are two different things. **Hostage** said that perhaps this debate is best left to specialists. **Attig** agreed, and asked if the parenthetical is then required at all. **Hostage** said that removing the parenthetical would be acceptable.

With no further discussion about the proposal, the **Chair** asked for a motion to approve the proposal with the suggested change that the parenthetical phrase, “as in the case of the English nominate reports prior to 1866,” be removed. She called for a motion to endorse the ALA proposal on the basis of the AALL document as amended by the committee in discussion. **Myers** made the motion. **Winzer** seconded. Without further discussion, a vote was called and the motion carried.

The **Chair** asked for any final comments on the first RDA revision proposal (16.2.2.9) brought by AALL. **Attig** stated that that discussion could be continued on the discussion list and if it becomes clear that a revised proposal is needed, it could be brought before CC:DA for discussion at a later date. **Tillett** asked Winzer if she was correct in understanding that Winzer would like to see Attig’s alternate proposal in writing. **Winzer** answered affirmatively. **Attig** conceded that

there are still some outstanding issues that he himself needs to understand better. He stated that putting the proposal in writing would be a good next step.

The **Chair** proposed that the group take up a more informal discussion of the current proposal and Attig's alternate proposal on the discussion list, and resume the formal discussion at a later date. **Attig** agreed that a more informal discussion would be a productive step forward. He stated that he would write up an informal proposal for CC:DA's consideration.

### **1128. Report of the CC:DA Task Force on RDA Instructions for Heads of State and Heads of Government: Winzer**

**Winzer** reported that the task force has been working since ALA Annual 2010 to determine whether it is possible to draft a single set of instructions that address both Heads of State and Heads of Government. She reported that the task force conducted a review of the historical development of the rules, and determined that the rules had been developed to accommodate chronologies in a card catalog environment. The task force concluded that changing the rules would consequently disrupt the chronology. The task force explored the possibility of using gender-neutral terms in the language of the jurisdiction, and considered specifying use of the masculine form, but found both approaches problematic. The task force will continue its work and submit a proposal before ALA Annual 2011.

**Myers** noted that this was not the first time the issue of chronological arrangement in an electronic environment has come up and required that specific cataloging rules be revisited.

**Winzer** asked whether it was reasonable to expect library catalogs to provide chronological lists.

**Attig** pointed out that left-to-right character sort of numerical textual strings is not the direction in which we should go. This is a coding issue—dates should be recorded and encoded separately. **Hillmann** concurred with Attig: this is a systems issue.

**Myers** pointed out that gender-neutral terms are not necessarily available to international cataloging agencies that opt to catalog in languages lacking such terms, so that approach is not viable if international adoption of RDA is to move forward.

**Winzer** asked whether the construction for Heads of State, etc. could not be simplified by eliminating years of the reign or incumbency from the headings. **Hillmann** asked, rhetorically,

whether we are talking about constructing headings for display or for machine-action, and noted that the real question is, what kind of information—what data elements—do we need to encode about heads of government or heads of state in order to provide the kind of functionality we desire. **Attig** stated that the question is, how do we want to group things?

**Creider** took issue with Hillmann's claim that this is a systems issue, and stated that he is reluctant to leave these decisions to systems personnel. Hillmann insisted that decisions about display should not be consensus driven, and that we should structure our data so that institutions are allowed to decide locally how the data is displayed.

**Winzer** stated that she will send a proposal to the group ahead of ALA Annual 2011.

#### **1129. Report of the CC:DA Task Force on RDA Instructions for Governmental and Non-Governmental Corporate Bodies: Randall**

**Randall** reported that the task force has been working since ALA Annual 2010 to identify the major issues preventing the development of a single instruction set to address both governmental and non-governmental corporate bodies. The group has identified the major differences in the instructions governing subordination and the recording of administrative or organizational hierarchies. **Randall** stated that the group has not yet started to draft a proposal, but will prepare one in the following months to present to CC:DA at ALA Annual 2011.

**Attig** asked if the group is considering proposing that the full hierarchy be recorded, and voiced his support for that idea. **Randall** responded by saying that that was one idea being discussed, but that serials catalogers might take issue with that proposal due to the frequency of name changes. **Attig** acknowledged that name changes would certainly create some issues, but encouraged the task force to give serious consideration to the idea. **Hillmann** voiced support for recording complete hierarchies, and said she saw it as an opportunity to free up library data for use outside of libraries. She also pointed out that display issues should not be a concern, since systems can be configured to display only those portions of the hierarchy that are of interest to users of a particular system.

#### **1130. Report from ALA Publishing Services: Linker**

**Linker** reported that over 5000 institutions signed up for RDA Toolkit access during the open-access period. As anticipated, roughly 20% of subscribers have signed up for solo-user

subscriptions. He had no major technical issues to report; he indicated that a few institutions have reported speed issues, but that in every case they have been issues originating on the subscribing institution's side. He reported that RDA has sold modestly well, with close to 2,000 sales—about average for an ALA Editions title—and that a print version of RDA has been published and that a second printing has already been scheduled. He noted that demand for RDA print has exceeded ALA Publishing's expectations.

LC Policy Statements have been added to the RDA Toolkit and links have now been implemented allowing users to navigate between RDA and the relevant LC Policy Statements.

**Linker** announced that fixed online subscription prices are now provided in eighteen currencies. He also announced that an offline subscription process has been put in place, and that consortial subscriptions are now available. ALA Publishing is looking to expand into social media, and will be launching a blog.

**Linker** detailed several enhancements that are currently planned for the RDA Toolkit, including adding examples to the element set view; allowing single user logins for those users who do not have IP authentication; and multilingual support. He stated that ALA Publishing is also working on how to communicate JSC updates visually within the RDA Toolkit, and expects to conduct surveys or assemble focus groups to collect feedback.

**Attig** asked whether workflows, example sets, mappings, etc. contributed by individuals or institutions could be shared with other institutions without going through ALA Publishing. **Linker** stated that workflows and mappings contributed by individuals can be shared with other institutions, and that individual users or institutions have control over determining what is shared, either locally or globally.

**Linker** closed by reminding meeting attendees that the double-user offer will be available through August 2011.

### **1131. Report from the RDA Training Task Force: Woodley**

The **Chair** presented a written report in Woodley's absence. She reported that the task force has organized a number of well attended webinars since ALA Annual 2010. Attendance and revenue figures will be detailed in a forthcoming report to be distributed to CC:DA.

The **Chair** announced several upcoming webinars and asked that any suggestions for future webinars be forwarded to the task force for consideration.

### **1132. Report from the RDA Programming Task Force: Abbas**

**Abbas** reported that 210 individuals participated in the ALA Annual 2010 preconference event, “RDA 101.” She reported that the update forum held on January 7, 2011 was very well-attended.

The ALCTS CCS Executive Committee has extended the work of the task force for at least one additional year. A two-day, hands-on “RDA 201” preconference event for ALA Annual 2011 has been approved and scheduled for June 23-24, 2011. The Task Force also hopes to schedule a vendors’ forum, in which vendors will discuss their plans for accommodating RDA, and a non-MARC forum. A preconference for ALA Annual 2012 is in the early planning stages, and **Abbas** requested that any suggestions or ideas be forwarded to the task force.

**Abbas** reported that task force members have been involved in a number of RDA outreach activities outside of ALA Midwinter and Annual meetings. She also mentioned that the task force was considering adding additional members so that it might better manage its workload. The task force is particularly interested in including constituencies that are presently not represented on the task force.

**Randall** asked whether participants in the “RDA 201” preconference will be expected to have completed the “RDA 101” preconference, and whether that preconference session will be offered to individuals who were not able to attend in the past or don’t have the requisite background knowledge of FRBR. **Abbas** responded by saying that the feedback the task force has received from “RDA 101” preconference attendees has indicated that the majority of participants would prefer more hands-on instruction, such as that planned for the “RDA 201” preconference. She said that the task force will be working to accommodate “RDA 201” attendees who have not attended previously the “RDA 101” session by publishing a list of documents, webinars, and tutorials as “required reading” for “RDA 201” attendance. **Hillmann** voiced her support for the task force’s approach, and stated that she and Karen Coyle have received similar feedback from participants in RDA-oriented webinars that they have offered. **Randall** pointed out, by way of analogy, that universities regularly offer introductory courses in order to accommodate newly matriculated students, and recommended that the task force consider the fact that many people are completely new to FRBR and RDA, and could benefit from an introductory session such as the “RDA 101” preconference. **Hillmann** suggested that recordings of such sessions should be

sufficient. **Myers** agreed with Randall that many within the cataloging community could benefit from an introductory session, but pointed out that there is likely to be very little overlap between that group and the group of people likely to attend ALA preconference sessions. He voiced support for the task force's plan, and stated that he thought a more hands-on session was appropriate for the ALA preconference attendee demographic.

**Scharff** asked Glennan to report on MLA's plans to offer an RDA preconference before its annual meeting in February. **Glennan** agreed with Abbas and Hillmann that the cataloging community from which she has received feedback seems eager to move beyond the theoretical underpinnings of RDA and onto more practical, hands-on instructional sessions. She stated that the full-day RDA preconference that MLA is planning will seek to move in that direction, and reported that 85 conference participants have signed up for the preconference event, and that others had to be placed on a waitlist.

### **1133. Report from the MARBI Representative: Myers**

**Myers** reported on actions taken during the first of two scheduled meetings. He reported on one proposal and two discussion papers considered during the first session.

#### 2011-01 Coding for Original Language in Field 041 (Language Code) of the MARC 21

Bibliographic Format. **Myers** reported that the proposal was approved with amendments. The revised definition of subfield \$h will specify that the language code is for the original language of the primary content of the item. The subfield is optional if the item is not a translation. Two new subfields have been approved: a subfield for the original language of a libretto, which was not yet specified, and a subfield \$m for the original language of additional material.

#### 2011-DPO3 Identifying Work, Expression, and Manifestation records in the MARC 21

Bibliographic, Authority, and Holdings Formats. **Myers** reported lively discussion at the MARBI meeting, and said that MARBI has decided to revisit the discussion paper as warranted, pending the outcome of the RDA test results.

#### 2011-DPO4 Treatment of Controlled Lists of Terms for Carrier Attributes in RDA and the MARC

21 Bibliographic Format. **Myers** reported minimal discussion at the MARBI meeting, and that MARBI has decided to revisit the discussion paper as warranted, pending the outcome of the RDA test results.

**Myers** reported that two additional discussion papers—2011-DP01 and 2011-DP02—would be taken up at the second session scheduled for January 9.

**1134. Report on LITA activities: Cheney**

**Cheney** reported on LITA activities planned for the remainder of the conference and encouraged attendance.

**1135. Report of the CC:DA webmaster: Polutta**

[CC:DA/Webmaster/2011/1]

**Polutta** thanked **Attig** for his assistance in helping to familiarize her with the CC:DA website and her responsibilities as webmaster.

**Polutta** stated that the CC:DA website that resides on ala.org—the page of record (hereafter, the ALA site)—cannot replace the CC:DA website that resides on psu.edu (hereafter, the PSU site); the PSU site is simply too large to fit into the ALA website structure. Consequently, for the foreseeable future CC:DA will maintain two separate web presences, and the ALA site will direct users to the site where the vast majority of CC:DA’s content is stored—currently, the PSU site.

**Polutta** reported that the ALCTS website is slated to be moved to Drupal in July, and advised that CC:DA wait until that move is complete before contemplating a redesign of the CC:DA website. She did not know whether ALA will require CC:DA to use Drupal or if CC:DA will be allowed to use another content management system or even build its own, since the CC:DA website will have its own server space.

**Polutta** stated that she would move forward with planning to overhaul the website and requested feedback to assist in developing templates and potential redesigns.

**Attig** noted one policy change: documents on the CC:DA website will be posted in PDF only, unless there is some compelling reason that they also be posted in Word format.

**1136. Report from the Chair on CCS Executive Committee meetings; other new business; reports from the floor; announcement of next meeting, and adjournment: Chair**



The **Chair** said that she and John Attig, along with Daniel Joudrey, the Chair of SAC, will be meeting with the CCS Executive Committee on Sunday, January 9, 2011, to discuss how CCS plans to respond to issues related to subject elements in RDA and communicate its positions to the JSC representative.

There were no announcements and no new business from the floor.

The **Chair** announced that meeting times for ALA Annual 2011, in New Orleans, La., will be on Saturday, June 25, from 1:30 to 5:30 p.m., and on Monday, June 27, from 8:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. She reported that she is considering holding a joint meeting of CC:DA and SAC at ALA Annual 2011, and that that meeting could take place during one of the two regularly scheduled CC:DA timeslots or separately—possibly on Friday, June 24.

The **Chair** adjourned the meeting at 4:59 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

John Ilardo, Intern

Gayle Porter, Intern